DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 424 649 EA 029 415

AUTHOR Pena, Robert A.
TITLE Community Based Organizations and Public Schools: Implications for Inclusion, Pedagogy, and the Organizational Context of Schools.
PUB DATE 1997-03-00
NOTE 68p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Acculturation; Educational Cooperation; Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; Nontraditional Education; Program Descriptions; *Public Schools; School Desegregation; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Friendly House was created in 1920 to promote literacy among new families entering the United States. An analysis of the afterschool and the summer-school programs offered by Friendly House is offered here. The study includes information on these programs, as well as the policies, practices, and procedures used in providing for the needs of economically disadvantaged children and their families. The text also describes the perceptions of Friendly House personnel regarding daily operations. The paper opens with demographic information for the area and details ways in which Friendly House serves the community. The study design is discussed next, along with the research questions and the findings. Results are grouped under six questions, such as How would students, instructors, tutors, and administrators describe their relationships with students and others? To what extent are curriculum and instruction related to students' present and future lives? What is the staff philosophy as regards working with students? and What types of support are offered at Friendly House? Recommendations for improving the process and quality of services delivered and for improving relations with the different public feeder schools that send students to Friendly House are given by various students and staff. (Nine appendices contain the tabulation of data.) (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 424 649

Community Based Organizations and Schools: Presented at the Annual American Education Research Association Conference (AERA) Chicago, Illinois- March 24-28. Please so not reprint or use in part or whole without the consent of the author. E-mail: rpena@imap2.asu.edu

Community Based Organizations and Public Schools: Implications for Inclusion, Pedagogy, and the Organizational Context of Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Peña
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

by

Robert A. Peña, Ph.D.

Arizona State University

Introduction

This study examines the functions of both the After School and Summer School program(s) offered by Friendly House. The After School and Summer School program(s) studied operated from September 1995 to May 1996, and June 1996 to August 1996 respectively. This study includes information on these programs and information on the policies, practices and procedures used in providing for the needs of economically disadvantaged children and their families. This research also describes the perceptions of Friendly House personnel regarding daily operations. Recommendations for improving the process and quality of services delivered, and for improving relations with the different public feeder schools that also send students to Friendly House are given by various students and Friendly House staff.

Background

Friendly House was created in 1920 as part of a local initiative by the Phoenix Americanization Committee and the U.S. Department of Education to promote literacy

EA 029 415

among new families entering the United States. During the 1980's, Friendly House enhanced its comprehensive services by creating the Joseph I. Flores Academia del Pueblo. This facility and its programs have worked to provide positive alternative activities for inner-city youth. These programs also promote educational, social, and cultural enrichment activities in collaboration with local feeder schools located in South Phoenix Arizona.

Local Demographic Information for Arizona, Phoenix and Maricopa County

The 1990 U.S. Census reports over 688,000 Hispanics living in Arizona, comprising just over 18% of the state's population and giving the state the eighth largest Hispanic population in the country. These data also indicate that the number of Hispanic residents in Arizona has increased by more than 50% since 1980. Of this percentage, over 50% of Arizona's Hispanics live in Maricopa County where Phoenix is located, while over 28% live in the City of Phoenix itself.

Additional data provided by the U.S. Department of Education (1990) reveal that the numbers of Hispanic children per household are higher when compared with the numbers of children in non-Hispanic households. These data also indicate that Hispanic families tend to be younger than non-Hispanic families, and that in many parts of the U.S. (including Arizona) Hispanics constitute the majority of minority students.

Finally, data taken from a report compiled in 1990 by the National Council of La Raza indicate that the numbers of Hispanic children enrolled in Arizona schools with "limited English Proficiency (LEP) skills and a "home language other than English"

continues to increase. The Arizona Department of Education (1990) similarly records that over 98,000 students are from non-English speaking homes. This figure represents over 16% of the total student population in Arizona public schools, while Spanish and American Indians constitute nearly 93% of the non-English speaking residents. In sum, the Center for Bilingual Education and Research at Arizona State University, the Arizona Department of Education, and the local feeder school districts with students also enrolled in Friendly House all agree that severe shortages in the numbers of Bilingual and English as Second Language endorsed teachers exist for limited English proficiency and non-English speaking students, and that this shortage is likely to continue to limit Hispanic students' opportunities to learn in Arizona and other U.S. public schools.

How Friendly House Serves the Community

Friendly House serves elementary and middle school aged children by helping them improve their academic performance in school. Friendly House does this by collaborating with the Phoenix Elementary School District No. 1, and the neighboring Chandler and Murphy School Districts. In addition to After School and Summer School programs, Friendly House offers adult education programs, social services and prevention activities, youth programs, home and personal care, rehabilitation, preschool, parenting skills training, and Parents as Partners programs. Friendly House Inc., Phoenix South Community Mental Health Center, and the Phoenix Revitalization Corporation have also established a collaboration to provide comprehensive social and

educational services to address the problems of substance abuse and gang activity involving students in the South Phoenix area. Studying the After School and Summer School educational components provided information on the backgrounds of students and families; information on Friendly House operations; and information on the relationship between Friendly House, Phoenix Elementary School District No. 1, and the neighboring Chandler and Murphy School Districts.

After School Program

Friendly House's After School Drop Out Prevention program was designed to help students realize higher academic outcomes in school. This program met Monday through Friday during after school hours from 3:00 to 6:00 p.m. Instructors and tutors provided students with assistance on daily homework assignments. Transportation from feeder schools to the Friendly House facility and a snack were also provided. Instructional support and assistance with homework assignments was delivered to students in grades 5 through 8.

Summer School Program

Friendly House's Summer School Drop Out Prevention program was designed to encourage and enhance students' motivation to learn. This program met Monday through Thursday during June and July from 8:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. Licensed instructors and tutors introduced and instructed students using public school and the Caesar Chavez Academy curriculum. This instruction focused on enhancing K-12 students' skills and knowledge in reading, writing, math and science. The Caesar

Chavez Academy curriculum was developed in cooperation with Arizona State University faculty and with the pupils' cultures and background interests in mind. Transportation from students' homes to the Friendly House facility and lunch were provided for students. Additionally, field trips to local Arizona events and landmarks were made available to students in grades K through 12.

Research Design, Methodology and Evaluation Questions

This inquiry made use of qualitative and quantitative methods to address the six questions shown in Figure 1. The design and methods of this assessment are informed by prior research on effective instruction. Previous studies have indicated that school membership, educational engagement, practitioners beliefs, and school support play significant roles in effecting positive change in student behavior patterns. These "benchmarks" guided the design and development of the data collection methods, interview protocols, analyses, findings, and recommendations which follow and are contained in this evaluation report.

Design

School membership describes the efforts of Friendly House and public school members to collaborate and develop positive respectful relations with students; to relate teaching and learning to students' present and future lives; and to express care and concern for students. Educational engagement involves coordinating and including students' interests and involvement in instructional initiatives and decisions. Practitioners' beliefs describes instructors, tutors and administrators expressing

commitment to collaboration, and extending their roles to strengthen students' weaknesses while demonstrating high tolerance for the attitudes and behaviors of students who may be resistant to teaching, learning, change and involvement in instruction. School support describes the combining of resources and aid to insure that 1) School and Friendly House staff have autonomy in decisions affecting the collaboration; 2) sufficiency of time is allocated to work together with students and other instructors, tutors and administrators; 3) curriculum content and instructional practices reflect school and Friendly House goals and objectives; 4) collaboration efforts are efficient and resist duplication; and 5) extensive development activities are available to instructors, tutors and administrators to insure that the needs of students and the partnership are being met.

Data Collection Methods

To assess the strengths and weaknesses of the collaboration and the After School and Summer School programs at Friendly House, this research relied upon empirical, hermeneutic, and critical data collection methods. These methods were utilized because they are current and have been found effective and reliable in past qualitative and quantitative assessments of partnerships with community based organizations.

Empirical data collection methods find their origins in the natural sciences. These methods place a premium on explanation and involve the "systematic and ongoing collection of descriptive data from participants about features of the school

context" (Sirotnik & Oakes, 1986, p. 81). This data collection method also requires generating a comprehensive knowledge base to compare and contrast with features of Friendly House. It involved the collection and analysis of monographs, articles, texts and current research on community based organizations and the development of a conceptual framework indicating keys to effective community based organizations. The results of this research led to the development of the four elements labeled school membership, educational engagement, practitioner's beliefs, and school support described earlier. These elements are widely agreed upon by researchers to be useful for assessment, evaluation and organizational reform, and were consequently utilized during the development of interview protocols used with students, instructors, tutors and administrators from Friendly House.

Hermeneutic data collection methods seek to discover meanings that individuals attach to features of their environments "to provide a deeper understanding of the context in human terms" (Sirotnik & Oakes, 1986, p. 81). These methods of research are oriented toward the interpretation and understanding of social events "in terms of the participants in those events including the researcher" (p. 23). Researchers find that hermeneutic data collection methods allow investigators to discover how "meaning about the organization is intersubjectively communicated and created" (Foster, 1984, p. 255). These methods were selected for this report due to the political and dynamic context of community based organizations in general, and because of the diverse meanings fixed to Friendly House by the previously mentioned participants of this

evaluation.

Critical data collection methods seek to discover "why things are what they are, how they got that way, and whose interests are being served by existing conditions (Sirotnik & Oakes, 1986, p. 81). These methods of evaluation place a premium on the "clarification of values and human interests" (p. 19) by analyzing discourse and organizational actions. The purpose of critical data collection methods is to indicate unequal social relations as they occur in institutions. Critical data collection methods were used during this investigation to assess Friendly House, and to determine how individuals traditionally disenfranchised from school (including students) interpreted and responded to Friendly House efforts.

Research Questions

The questions developed and utilized to understand the collaboration and After School and Summer School programs at Friendly House are listed below in Table 1.

Table 1. Partnership, After School and Summer School Research Questions.

Research Questions	
1.	***How would you describe your relationship(s) with:***
	a. Students
	b. Staff and Administration
	c. Teachers, Staff and Administrators [at Friendly House] in Phoenix Elementary School District No. 1, and the neighboring Chandler and Murphy School Districts
2.	***To what extent is curriculum and instruction related to students' present and future lives? Explain.***
3.	***What is your philosophy for working with students?***
4.	***What can you say about the support your given?***
5.	***What is the purpose of the Friendly House*** **[Phoenix Elementary School District No. 1, Chandler and Murphy School District] collaboration*? Explain.***
6.	***How well does the collaboration meet that purpose? Explain.***

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Findings

Question 1: How would you (students, instructors, tutors, administrators) describe your relationship(s) with:

Students

Twelve students including four 5th, four 6th, two 7th and two 8th graders enrolled at Friendly House volunteered and were interviewed and observed for this research. These students were selected because they were participants in both the After School and Summer School Drop Out Prevention programs at Friendly House and because they were students addressed by the collaboration. Student class work was also shared with the researcher at Friendly House and in the participating feeder schools.

Analyses of the data collected through interactions and observations with students and the study of students' class work revealed that each student categorized her or his relationship with other Friendly House/collaboration students as "very good" and "good." Words and phrases most often used by students included "nice," "really nice," "best friend," and "caring." Observations of students during class, lunch hours and during After and Summer School programs similarly found students cooperating, demonstrating mutual support, playing, laughing, holding hands, bonding and significant familiarity and confidence in each. No discernable pattern of isolation and alienation among students was apparent as student interactions crossed genders, languages and age groups. Analyses of student class work including journals found students describing positive images of interactions with other students involved in the

collaboration *(see Appendix A. Table 2.)*.

Students participating in this research also categorized interactions and relations with school and Friendly House instructors, tutors and administrators as "very good" and "good." These students used words and phrases like "respectful," "helpful," "patient," "interested" and "caring" when describing interactions with teachers and staff. These students were able to recall the names of teachers, instructors, tutors, and school and Friendly House administrators, and each student was able to describe particular instances when they interacted with various staff. These instances included occasions when staff "met" and "talked one to one" with students, when staff "talked alone" or privately, and when staff "gave a quarter for ice cream one time." Finally, students also admitted that they were occasionally resistant to "doing homework," "working," and "doing stuff in class sometimes," but also agreed that they "knew [they] had to work" and that students "would come around eventually."

Staff and Administration

A total of forty practitioners were interviewed for this study. These practitioners included two school administrators, eight support staff and 16 teachers; four of five Friendly House instructors, eight tutors, and two Friendly House administrators. These pschool ractitioners and Friendly House staff members were interviewed because they volunteered, were knowledgeable of the partnership, After School and Summer School Drop Out Prevention programs, and because of their relevance to this research.

Analyses of the data collected through interviews with these participants

revealed that each categorized her or his relationship with students as "very good" and "good." Words and phrases most often used by staff included "respectful," "caring," "understanding," "tolerant," and "patient." Observations of staff similarly found them extending themselves and redefining their roles to support students with academic work and students' personal problems. Eleven of 14 Friendly House members also demonstrated fluency in Spanish while three held little to no Spanish language skills. No discernable pattern of isolation and alienation for students was apparent during observations of staff and staff-student interactions across genders, languages and age groups. Analyses of data relevant to curriculum and instruction revealed that materials and teaching methodologies accounted for the interests, learning styles, languages and developmental levels of students. These analyses also indicated that instruction was provided in both English and Spanish at Friendly House dependant on enrollment and the cultural background characteristics of students. Analyses of curriculum of instruction data also indicated that Friendly House staff were more knowledgeable and facile with the Summer School curriculum as compared with the After School curriculum activities. Finally, members discussions about theirs and others' relationships with students indicated that less than 50% described concerns for their overall influence on students. These staff explained that uncertainty about the nature and purpose of the school/community based organization partnership, students' feeder schools and the personnel, curriculum, teaching methods, school policy and procedures used in those schools, and inadequate time also limited their capacity to teach and provide students

with adequate academic support. These school personnel and Friendly House staff also explained that "staff turnover" at Friendly House was a "problem" that limited continuity and staff members' potential to teach and provide students with opportunities for improved academic performance.

School personnel and Friendly House Staff members participating in this research categorized interactions and relations with other each other and with instructors, tutors and administrators as "very good," "good" and "average." These staff used words and phrases like"cordial," "friendly," "nice," "respectful," "helpful," "teamwork," "interested" and "caring" when describing interactions with other personnel and with Friendly House staff. Eleven teachers and three Friendly House staff members categorized their relationships with different administrators as "average" and "just average" explaining that administrators "seemed busy," "were really busy" and were "sometimes not able to talk." These 14 participants also described their familiarity with administrators as "average."

Question 2: To what extent are curriculum and instruction related to students' present and future lives? Explain.

Students

Four of the twelve students interviewed indicated that curriculum and instruction received at school and at Friendly House was "strongly related" to their present and future lives. Two students indicated that an "average relationship" existed between curriculum and instruction and their present and future lives, and six indicated that the

relationship between these variables was "not strong" and was "weak." Of those students who described curriculum and instruction as "strongly related" to their present and future, each explained that their instructor(s) "talked about how math was important for everything," and that instructors and tutors were "always saying how learning to read and do good in school was important," that "working hard in school would help you graduate and get a job and go into college maybe." For those two who indicated that an average relationship existed, each described "friends," "brothers and sisters" and "neighbors" that "didn't think school was worth it" and that "didn't think school was nothing." These students also did not see the relevance of curriculum and instruction in their public feeder schools and in Friendly House, and did not "know" what careers or "jobs [they] wanted to do in the future." The remaining six students who described the relationship between curriculum and instruction in school and at Friendly House and their present and future lives as "not strong" and "weak" indicated that instructors and tutors: (a) "never really talked about what I wanted to do;" (b) "didn't have time to explain about careers;" and © "didn't talk about [the student's feeder school]" and "ask what my teacher's names was." Three of these six students also stated that Friendly House "doesn't even have our school books or the workbooks and papers we get in our regular school" (see Appendix B. Table 3.).

Staff and Administrators

Analyses of the data collected through interviews with practitioners and staff members revealed that 14 individuals' responses meant they categorized the

relationship between school and Friendly House curriculum and instruction and students' present and future lives as "very strong" and "strong." The 26 remaining practitioners and staff gave responses that were categorized as "average," "not strong" and "very weak." Of those 14 practitioners and staff who communicated a "very strong" and "strong" relationship between the school, Friendly House, the curriculum and instruction and students' present and future lives, each described relationships between students' learning at Friendly House and their schools, and students learning "for life," "to become good United States citizens," "so they could graduate," "to get a half way decent job," "to get out of the neighborhood," and "so they could go into the university or community college or something and make something for their future."

Regarding the 26 administrators, teachers and staff members whose responses were categorized as "average," "not strong" and "very weak," four stated that the collaboration was important for "keeping some of these kids alive," for 'keeping them out of gangs and trouble in their neighborhoods," and for giving students "something to do besides watch television all day." These responses were categorized "average." Finally, responses categorized as "very weak" included those that did not draw a clear relationship between learning at school and Friendly House, and learning for students' future lives. These responses included comments like "good experience," "good work experience," and "useful experience for getting a future job to start with" and did not emphasize a relationship between curriculum and instruction at school and Friendly House, and curriculum and instruction that was useful to students' immediate and long

term futures.

Question 3: What is your philosophy for working with students?

Student Responses

All twelve students interviewed stated that school practitioners, instructors and tutors at Friendly House emphasized academics, hence their responses were categorized as "academic support" for students. Six students said that staff discussed social relations or "getting along with others" and nine students made statements related to staff discussing culture and "using culture" in school and at Friendly House.

Academic Support

For those twelve students who commented that staff emphasized academics, each agreed that bringing homework from school was "important," "very important" and required. One student explained that "you have to bring your homework to do [because] if you don't... they'll give you more work than the school does." Another student concurred by stating that "Sometimes I fake like I don't have homework to do, but then they give me work anyway so I might as well do mine." Each student indicated that attending Friendly House's After School Program increased the rate of homework completion. These students explained that they completed fewer school assignments prior to their enrollment in the After School program. One student added that the mathematics teacher from his feeder school "got mad because [Friendly House staff] taught them Algebra different" (see Appendix C. Table 4.).

Regarding the Summer School program, students indicated that instructors and

tutors seemed more knowledgeable and enthusiastic about the Caesar Chavez Academy curriculum than about materials used in the After School program. These students revealed that academics also were "important," "very important" and required during the summer, and seven believed that instructors and tutors "seemed like they knew what they were talking about better," "knew more what they were saying," "had a plan," and were "excited" and "happier about what they were teaching." Three of the twelve students interviewed added that they did not understand "how summer school" and how "what we're learning had to do with regular school."

Social Development

As noted earlier six of twelve students indicated that school and Friendly House staff talked about and were concerned about "social development." Social development in this context is defined as "the life long process by which individuals acquire the beliefs, attitudes, customs, values, roles, and expectations of a culture or social group" (Craig, G.J. & Kermis, M.D., 1995, p. 114). Hence, when interviewees indicated that instruction included statements on acquiring "beliefs" and "values" for example, these explanations were categorized "social development."

Of those six students who indicated that staff emphasized "social development," each agreed that instructors and tutors felt it was "important," and "very important" for students to acquire good citizenship skills, avoid crime and drugs, and for students to complete high school. One student explained that staff "want us to fit in good and be successful with other people," while another student commented that "their [teachers,

instructors and tutors were] always saying about watching out in the neighborhood, and staying away from drugs and people who are trouble." Three students agreed in separate interviews that school practitioners and staff revealed that "Friendly House was for making sure you finished [high school]," "graduate," and "finished twelfth grade so you could get a good job and get some money and a family and whatever." The students interviewed and included in this report indicated that teachers, administrators and Friendly House staff emphasized citizenship skills, avoiding crime and drugs, and the completion of high school in both the After School and Summer School programs at Friendly House.

Cultural Awareness

Nine of the twelve students interviewed indicated that practitioners and staff emphasized "cultural awareness." These students perceived that school practitioners and Friendly House staff felt that cultural awareness was "important." Four students explained for example, that Friendly House instructors and "sometimes tutors" talked about "Mexico," and "how things were like back in Mexico," and "that in the United States you have more freedom to do stuff and to make more money than in Mexico." Three students described "how school teachers said it was good that we could speak two languages, but that we would have to speak English really good to do good in the United States." Finally, two students added that school and Friendly House staff said "it would be hard" and that "a lot of people don't think we can make it," but that "we should keep on trying" and "keep working hard," and that students "should be proud" and "[not]

forget their families and where they came from."

School and Friendly House Staff Responses

Twenty four of the forty school practitioners and Friendly House staff interviewed indicated that they emphasized academics and "academic support" for students. Eighteen teachers and staff members said that they discussed social relations or "social development," and seven of forty teachers and staff interviewed made statements related to supporting and developing the "cultural awareness" of students.

Academic Support

Of those twenty-four teachers and staff who indicated that they emphasized academics, each agreed that doing and bringing homework from school was "important," "very important" and "necessary." One staff member said that "once students understood what you expected from them early on, and that you weren't going to let them slide, then the majority would start to bring homework nearly all the time" to the after school program. Another explained that "students know their expected to bring homework everyday after school and they usually do." A third staff member indicated that "one or two [of 15 students] sometimes don't bring homework, or they say they don't have any or they already did it in school, but later you'll see, they'll take it out and get started on it so we can help them out." Four staff members indicated that work is provided for those students who arrive at the After School program without homework to complete, and that this work includes dittoes and handouts on "fractions" and "writing activities like journals." Each of the eleven Friendly House staff who indicated that they

emphasized academics with students also explained that students arrived fatigued after school from their feeder schools, and that it was a challenge to get students motivated and working in the After School program. One staff member explained that

> ".... some of them [students] start school at 8:00 so you know they get up earlier than that. Then they go until maybe 3 or 3:30 so that by the time they get here they just want to relax and not think about school and learning. Even the best ones who always do their homework come in and want a day off sometimes so you just tell them to relax and at least start their homework so they can finish it at home. Giving them their snack seems to get them going when they say their tired or they don't want to work. The thing is that they really got to work and get their homework at least started when they come here or they'll just want to sit around or use the computer games."

Seven Friendly House staff added that they preferred the Summer School to the After School program at Friendly House because of increased opportunities for planning and autonomy over curriculum and instruction. These instructors and tutors worked in both programs from at least 1995 to 1996 and were thus able to make comparisons and offer insights about these programs and about the partnership. They explained that having the Caesar Chavez Academy curriculum allowed them to understand the scope and sequence of topics to be covered in advance during the summer. They added that opportunities to gather resources and "work cooperatively"

with other Friendly House staff were also increased. Staff stated that using this curriculum was "exciting for us and the kids because we can experiment with it and decide how it should be taught." Another staff member explained that (s)he was involved in "developing the curriculum and that except for the dittoes and drill, the students seemed to enjoy it." Finally, four of the seven staff members who also indicated that they preferred the Summer School to the After School program at Friendly House agreed that student motivation was less a problem. These staff stated that "having the children all day from 8:30 to 2:00 makes them feel like this is their school and like they can do things and go places that their friends at home can't do." Three staff disagreed indicating that at first, students did not expect that they would have to work during the Summer program, but that later students "found out they would have to work." One of these staff explained that

> "even though we [instructors and tutors] tell them [students] that learning is important and they will have an advantage next year in school, it still seems like they learn [from other staff] that they don't have to worry about doing things. This is a problem because you want them to learn and do the work and think about school, but [other staff] feel like they do, like they can take it easy and just come to Friendly House for the summer."

Social Development

Of those seven staff who indicated that they taught and emphasized "social development," each agreed that it was "important," and "very important" for students to

acquire good citizenship skills, avoid crime and drugs, and for students to complete high school. One staff member explained that "these kids are good and really do good here but you don't know how they act when their home and in their other schools, and it they really listen. That's why I think its important that you talk to them about how they act and how to get along better with others." A second staff member added that "I've been to their homes and seen their families and how they live and I worry that their friends or the other kids in the neighborhood will bring them down and get them into trouble. So I tell them about peer pressure and to not do drugs." Finally, a third staff member revealed that (s)he

> "....heard from a student that another student who left Friendly House was killed. So I told him that's why he has to be here everyday... so he can learn and be safe, and so he can get his diploma and graduate from high school and look for a job."

This staff member added that

> "when you come here and park in the parking lot it really looks bad and the neighborhood does too. But then when you come inside there's things happening and people working. These kids don't know it but it's like the calm inside the storm. They're away from trouble and they don't have to stay inside and watch television all day. At Friendly House they go places and learn things that they probably wouldn't be able to do otherwise."

Cultural Awareness

Seven of the fourteen staff members interviewed indicated that they emphasized "cultural awareness" and that they felt that teaching cultural awareness was "important." Five staff explained that they "talked about Mexico," and "where the students come from so they could understand about their ancestors and about what's going on in Mexico right now." One staff member explained that (s)he discussed "the economy back in Mexico," and "how so many people are poor and that in living the United States like they [students] do would be an improvement." Three staff described how they 'teach in both English and Spanish so the students will learn and feel good about themselves and learn." Finally, one staff member stated that (s)he was proud of his/her Hispanic culture, and that (s)he wanted "the students to see that it's possible for them to work here and make it too."

Question 4: What can you say about the support your given at Friendly House?

Students

Analyses of the data collected through interactions and observations with students and the study of students' class work indicated that each student categorized the support received at Friendly House as "very strong" and "strong." Words and phrases most often used by students included "helpful," "interested," and "involved." Observations of students during class and lunch hours similarly indicated that students enjoyed positive and supportive relationships with other students and with Friendly House staff. No discernable pattern of isolation and alienation among students was

apparent as student interactions crossed genders, languages and age groups. In contrast, indications that student differences were acknowledged, accepted and appreciated were revealed through analyses of student class work including student journals. In particular, this analysis indicated that interview discussions and descriptions contained in students' work included positive phrases, self-images and reflections of interactions with other students and Friendly House staff (see Appendix D. Table 5.).

Further evidence of the support given to students emerged when they were able to recall occasions when they were praised, recognized and made to feel welcome by other students and Friendly House instructors, tutors, and administrators. One student described how a staff member called her "mia (mine) like my mom does." Another student recalled "when [a staff member] asked me to help [another student] with his fractions. This made me feel good like he knew I could it." Finally, five students explained how staff "just talked to you like you were important," how staff "knew things," "listened," and "didn't always have to say something when you talked to them." These students added that instructors, tutors and administrators "even talked with you about things that was going on and didn't have nothing to do with what was going on over here [at Friendly House].

Regarding textbooks and classroom materials available to instructors and tutors, all twelve students agreed that Friendly House staff did not have adequate school supplies. These students indicated that instructors and staff "counted pencils," "told us

to return pencils" and to "be careful with pencils because they didn't have enough." Similarly, these students confirmed that textbooks, workbooks and other materials found in their feeder schools were generally not available at Friendly House. Finally, students' perceptions about relationships involving Friendly House staff indicated that students believed that instructors and tutors "get along good," that "they seemed like they like each other" and that "the teachers know what each other is doing."

Staff and Administration

Analyses of the data collected through interviews and observations with staff members revealed that each categorized the support received at Friendly House as "very strong," "strong" and "average." These staff used words and phrases like "patient," "tolerant," commitment," and "interested" when describing relations with students. These staff also used expressions including "easy," "smart," "knowledgeable, "understanding," "useful" and "very reliable" when describing relations with other staff. Additionally, observations found staff extending themselves to provide coverage and support for students, each other and support related to academic work.

Specific examples of how staff supported students were revealed when instructors and tutors described the various learning styles, the prior knowledge and the strengths and weaknesses of students. One staff member explained that "you have to be flexible and understanding when working with these students because their so different and they have so many different levels." Another said that (s)he attempts "to make connections between what they know about and what we're teaching them so

they can do better and remember more." A third described "learning about the students because they seem so far behind where I thought they would be when I first started." Finally, another staff member added that "the kids are really good and able to learn, but many of them have poor skills so you need to be patient and willing to start with them from where there are."

Particular examples of how staff supported each other became apparent when they described interactions with each other and conversations held during staff meetings. These staff explained that "we sometimes talk about what we're teaching and I get advice on ways for teaching math." Staff also described conversations about students and "what (s)he does to get [a student] motivated and involved." Finally, staff interactions and support also described organizational considerations related to scheduling, field trips and transportation. Staff explained that "we pretty much know when the other is teaching and where in case we need to find someone or move," and that "we [staff members] share driving the vans when we take students home or on field trips."

Regarding the Summer School program at Friendly House, instructors and tutors who also worked in the After School program from at least 1995 to 1996 were asked to compare, contrast and offer insights about the extent of support provided during the summer. These staff explained that having the Caesar Chavez Academy curriculum also provided them with "some materials" but that Friendly House generally "did not have enough materials to use during the summer with students." Three staff members

indicated that they "got some money to buy materials to use with the students," but that "the supplies would run out fast." Two staff members commented on the need to "pass out the pencils and then collect them before the class was over." Finally, two staff members also explained that they purchased materials "with my own money" and "brought books from where I work during the school year to help out the students" respectively.

As noted earlier, three staff did not believe that adequate support for curriculum and instruction was provided during the Summer School program. These staff were critical of other staff member's "laid back" and "hands-off approach." These staff explained that teaching students during the summer "was a challenge" and that "more structure is needed if the students are going to learn and behave." Additionally, staff members at Friendly House explained that greater structure was also needed at staff meetings. These instructors, tutors and administrators said that "we sometimes have a meeting scheduled and you know it's going to start whenever. Then when we get started and people are running in and leaving and you wonder what's going to get done."

Question 5: What is the purpose of the partnership? Explain.

Analyses of the data collected through interactions and observations with students and the study of their class work indicated that they held varied interpretations of the specific purpose(s) of the After School and Summer School programs at Friendly House. Similarly, instructors, tutors and administrators did not agree on the specific

purpose(s) of the After School and Summer School programs. Nonetheless, after analyzing the responses of students and staff, and analyzing student work, informal observation data, and evaluation notes, findings were categorized as "academic support," "social development" and "cultural awareness" activities.

Students

Six of twelve students interviewed indicated that Friendly House was formed to provide "academic support." These students explained that the After School program "helped students with homework assignments and with math and reading." Two students believed that Friendly House provided training in social skills, and four students indicated that Friendly House was designed for safety and crime prevention.

Further evidence that six students believed that Friendly House was formed for academic support emerged when these students were asked to explain how they could be sure about the purpose of Friendly House. When asked for proof, one student noted that "everyday during the regular school year they [instructors and tutors] are on you about doing homework and bringing homework to do in class." Another student said that "you can tell they [staff] really want us to do well in school because they sometimes want to know how we did and what we got on our homeworks and tests and quizzes and reading." A third student commented that "you can tell the teachers [instructors and tutors] really care here because they like to ask how was your school day and what did you learn in school today?" (see Appendix E. Table 6.).

These six students similarly explained that the Summer School program at

Friendly House was created for academic support. These students commented that "they're [instructors and tutors] always running around checking your paper and seeing if you understand or not." A second student explained that his instructor "likes to go over and go over what we just learned so we don't forget," and a third student stated that Friendly House staff working in the Summer School program "wanted to jump us ahead so we wouldn't be like the other kids who forgot their school work, and so we could know something when school got started."

Of the two students who identified the purpose of Friendly House as related to their social development, these students revealed that staff cared most about students showing tolerance and adjusting to "fit in in school." These two students stated that Friendly House staff wanted them "to listen to people," and 'to give other students a chance" when they attended their feeder schools. These students also mentioned that staff warned them that they "could have to change" and that they "had to do what you were said to if you wanted to be somebody in life."

Finally, evidence that four students interpreted the purpose of Friendly House to be related to safety and crime prevention emerged when these students indicated that the After School and Summer School programs were intended to "keep kids safe and out of trouble." These students stated that Friendly House staff explained that students "wouldn't get hurt or in any trouble if their parents knew where they were" and "if they came all the time." These students also commented that staff advised that "kids can get in trouble and can get hurt when they get bored and don't got nothing to do." One

student added that her instructor "told us about a boy who was killed because he didn't come to Friendly House no more."

Staff and Administrators

Analyses of the data collected through interviews and observations with staff members revealed that all fourteen staff members categorized the purpose of Friendly House as related to "academic support." Five staff members mentioned topics related to "social development," and three gave statements related to building "cultural awareness." These staff explained that "helping students finish their homework and do well in school was the main purpose of the After School and Summer School program." Additionally, those five staff members that also described social development activities, indicated that they hoped to "improve how students related to others." Of the remaining three staff members that favored increased cultural awareness, each said they wanted students "to be happy" and "to be proud of themselves" and "proud of their families."

Additional evidence that all fourteen of the instructors, tutors and administrators interviewed believed that Friendly House was established for academic support emerged when these staff members also were asked to explain how they could be sure about the purpose of Friendly House. When asked for proof, one staff member explained that "we were told during our training that we were here to help the students with their school work." Another staff member supported this by saying that "that's why it's called an After School program." A third staff member also added that (s)he reminds the students enrolled in the After School program that "they're their to do work,

and not to talk or just sit."

Of the five staff who identified the purpose of Friendly House as also related to students' social development, three indicated that students "needed help adjusting," "fitting in" and "getting along with others." Two mentioned that students "had to learn that you need help from others" and that "their teachers and counselors wouldn't help them if they [students] didn't try to meet them at least half way." One explained that (s)he wanted the students "to have fun." This staff member indicated that (s)he wanted students to "think of Friendly House as their home. A place where they can come and feel wanted and safe." This staff member also added that Friendly House students "don't have a lot of things so that it's important that they [students] get something while they're over here."

Finally, evidence that three staff members also interpreted the purpose of Friendly House as related to enhancing cultural awareness emerged when these staff explained that the After School and Summer School programs were intended to help students "learn about themselves," "learn about their home country," and that "teaching the students about their culture also teaches them about their identity." These three staff members stated that "Friendly House was different because we have many Mexican students" and "they get to learn from instructors who are Mexican like them and who speak Spanish." In addition, one of these three staff explained that "the students have real good role models who teach and go to college.. so they should be proud of where they're from."

Question 6: How well does Friendly House meet that purpose? Explain.

Analyses of the data collected through interactions and observations with students and the study of their class work indicated that they felt the After School and Summer School programs at Friendly House worked "very well" and "well." Instructors, tutors and administrators also agreed that the specific purpose(s) of the After School and Summer School programs at Friendly House were being met "very well" and "well." Additionally, staff indicated that change, commitment and additional support were needed for Friendly House to continue to serve the community and students at a high level.

Students

Each of the twelve students interviewed indicated that Friendly House was meeting their intended purpose "very well" and "well." These students explained that their homework completion rates improved and remained high due to the After School program. Five students added that their report card grades were better and one described earning extra points in her feeder school. Two students also revealed that they made new friends, and four students indicated that Friendly House probably kept them out of trouble, safe and alive.

Evidence that the students believed that Friendly House was meeting its intended purpose very well and well emerged when the students were asked to identify "How well Friendly House served them?" and "How they were different because of their participation in Friendly House?" One student stated that "knowing the teachers and

tutors know who you are and that they care about you sometimes makes you want to work even harder for them and then you get your homework done and you do better in school." Another student explained that "we're supposed to get our homework done after we get here [in the After School program] so I do it. If I skip out and don't do the homework from school, then my mother and the other teachers get all on me and it gets to be a headache so I just do it and it makes things better." Two other students described how participating in the After School program helped by explaining that "homework is collected" and "counted" by feeder school teachers respectively, so that if it is not completed and submitted by students, they will earn "a lower homework grade average" and "points taken off my report card grade in arithmetics."

Of the two students who gave statements that identified an additional purpose of Friendly House as related to the students' social development, these students explained that "meeting people here [at Friendly House] and making more friends gave me more self confidence in myself" and "someone to know when I go back to regular school." These two students agreed that Friendly House was "good" and "better than regular school" because they "got to know people better" and they "feel good, like what I say matters over here." These two students also described how they changed and learned "not to always get into fights when you got a trouble" and "to give everybody a second chance to say what's going on." (see Appendix F. Table 7.).

Finally, evidence that four students also interpreted the purpose of Friendly House as related to safety and crime prevention and that Friendly House satisfied this

purpose very well and well emerged when these four students indicated that they each knew youth that were "in gangs," "stealing," "banging," "breaking into people's houses" and "always getting in bad trouble in school" and "with the police." These four students added that the After School program prevented them from engaging in misconduct as "it gives you a excuse not to go with people you know want to get in trouble." Friendly House also "gives you [students] something to do instead of watching TV and getting bored and going outside and looking for something to do."

When rating the effectiveness of the Summer School program at Friendly House, these twelve students indicated that they were confident about achieving success upon their return to their feeder schools. They explained that they "won't forget what the teachers said last year [in their feeder school]" and that Friendly House students held an "advantage" because "you're learning all the time and in the summer too when a lot of kids just watch television and don't do nothing with their free time." Of those six students that also rated the After School program's effectiveness in developing social skills and promoting safety highly, each student also gave like responses when assessing the Summer School program. These students stated that the Summer School program was "even better" and "better" for "making friends" and "getting along," and that the Summer School program "helped more because you're always here," "you're busy and going places" and "a lot of your friends are here instead of in the neighborhood only so you can do things with them and stay away from trouble like that."

Staff and Administrators

Analyses of the data collected through interviews and observations with staff members revealed that all fourteen staff members that categorized the purpose of Friendly House as related to "academic support," also rated the program(s) effectiveness highly. These staff members explained that the purpose(s) of Friendly House were met "very well" and "well." Of those five staff members that also described purposes related to "social development," four rated Friendly House efforts as working "very well" and one rated the After School and Summer School program(s) as doing "well." Of the remaining three staff members that associated increased cultural awareness with Friendly House goals, each rated the two programs as performing "very well" and "well."

Additional evidence that all fourteen of the instructors, tutors and administrators interviewed believed that Friendly House programs were performing "very well" and "well" in providing academic support to students emerged when these staff described how students were effected by curriculum, instruction and students' interactions at Friendly House. Four staff members indicated that they believed the After School and Summer School programs were working "very well" because "the students show progress," "their language skills improve," "they start to ask more questions and better questions about what they're learning," and because "most of the students can solve problems and do things in math that they couldn't do when they first got started." One staff member also explained that "the students see that I take learning seriously and

that I think some of them should begin to take learning more seriously too... and they do." Another staff member said that "they [students] change when they get here and in your classes. You can see it. They start all wild and running around then when you get them they settle down and start to work right away. Before, when they first came here, you had to spend more time with them getting them quiet and organized so they could listen and your time was all burned out. Now, things go faster... you have more time to teach and for them to learn the lessons." One staff member said that "when we go over problems in the summer classes you can see when they get it because it's like a light goes on when they [students] learn something new."

Of the five staff who identified the purpose of Friendly House as also related to students' social development and rated the After School and Summer School programs as doing "very well" and "well," four revealed that students "made progress adjusting to their new surroundings," "began to fit in" and that students "supported each other more" and "got along better with each other." One said that "sometimes the shy students sit on the outside or in the back of the classroom, but then later they join the group and start to participate." Two mentioned that non English speaking students "sat together," "talk only to each other" and "didn't play with the other students at first, but then they learn to fit in and to have fun with the other kids." Another staff member added that (s)he believed the students "learned to smile more the longer they were at Friendly House. This staff member also indicated that some Friendly House students "sometimes never saw the things and don't know how to use the materials that we use

in class. Later though they get used to doing the activities and they seem to like show off the things they like to do."

Of the three staff members that rated Friendly House as doing an effective job of promoting cultural awareness, each explained that students "never saw," "didn't learn about" and "didn't think that their ancestors had an effect on history in the United States and now they do." Two staff members described "modeling" and how "being examples to the students" provides opportunities "so they can see a Chicana or Chicano who made it." One staff member explained that "teaching the students in English and in Spanish makes all the difference in making them feel good about their families and who they are." These staff members said they knew their efforts were having a desired effect because "students would speak up in class" and "those students who liked to keep to themselves their ears would perk-up when you talked about their home lands and where they come from." Finally, Friendly House staff also indicated that "the students would bring in things" and "show off things that they had at home to show to the class about their families and when they came to the United States." Another staff member added that

> "...the kids here aren't stupid, it's not like they can't learn... it's just that some are new to this country and some don't yet understand about their rights. So I think that for some of them, probably more than half of them, you have to teach them to be proud and not to be lazy. You have to say

to them that if they work hard they can be anything and do as good as anybody and be happy too. Their parents don't know. They don't understand how they can talk to the schools about their kids. Over here, at Friendly House, I think they [the parents] see that we're a community based organization, and that we are here for them and for their children. I think that some of the parents see that and that some of them learn to talk to the schools. I think that their kids learn too that they have to say something. I think that if the parents don't say something, and that if the students don't say something, then nothing will happen. A lot of these people [feeder school personnel] don't care about these kids. They act like they own the kids and they own the schools but they don't... my kids this and my kids that... and this is my school. It's the people who are supposed to own the schools and not the teachers and principals and the superintendents. We talk about these things to the parents and some of them go to the schools and say something."

Discussion and Recommendations

Discussion

Question 1. How would you describe your relationship(s) with: Students, Staff and Administrators

Student Membership

Students described their relationships with other students and Friendly House

staff as "very strong" and "strong." These student responses indicate that they feel happy, comfortable and safe at Friendly House, and that Friendly House students enjoy a high level of student membership at this community based organization. School membership describes the efforts of Friendly House staff to develop positive respectful relations with students; to relate teaching and learning to students' present and future lives; and to express care and concern for students. Evidence that students enjoyed high levels of student membership emerged when students explained that "cared for each other" and that they believed that staff "respected" and "cared" for them as a group and as individuals. These findings were corroborated by staff who also described their relationships with students as "respectful," "caring" and "positive."

Educational Engagement

None of the students interviewed for this evaluation recalled being involved or asked to participate in curricular and instructional decisions in the After School and Summer School programs at Friendly House. These students indicated that activities practiced during the After School program were based upon homework assignments and did not require extensive lesson plan development by Friendly House staff. Additionally, students indicated that the Summer School curriculum and that instructional methods used by staff did not involve the students in planning and designing initiatives for learning. Friendly House instructors, tutors and administrators confirmed these observations by claiming the lion's share of the responsibility for planning and instruction. Research indicates that involving students in program

planning, design and implementation is an effect strategy for enhancing student attendance to learning and for improving student performance. In short, achieving full educational engagement involves including students' interests and involvement in instructional initiatives and decisions. Based on these criterion, analyses indicate that Friendly House staff did not include students in decision making related to curriculum and instruction and that these instructors, tutors and administrators may have unwittingly limited students engagement in learning.

Staff Relationships

Analyses of the data collected indicated that Friendly House staff defined their interactions with other instructors, tutors and administrators as "very strong" and "strong." These staff described their relationships with peers as "supportive," "helpful" and "positive." Friendly House staff also indicated that work assignments were delegated fairly and evenly. These staff indicated that they had preferences for different teaching levels, but that their preferences were not taken into account when making teaching and classroom assignments. No staff members could identify rationales for teaching and classroom assignments.

Additionally, some Friendly House staff were uncertain about expectations held for them by other staff members. These staff indicated that their expectations for students differed from expectations held by other staff and that they were "confused," "frustrated" and uncertain regarding Friendly House objectives for students. This uncertainty and confusion did not emerge when discussing the After School program,

Staff Relationships

Analyses of the data collected indicated that Friendly House staff defined their interactions with other instructors, tutors and administrators as "very strong" and "strong." These staff described their relationships with peers as "supportive," "helpful" and "positive." Friendly House staff also indicated that work assignments were delegated fairly and evenly. These staff indicated that they had preferences for different teaching levels, but that their preferences were not taken into account when making teaching and classroom assignments. No staff members could identify rationales for teaching and classroom assignments.

Additionally, some Friendly House staff were uncertain about expectations held for them by other staff members. These staff indicated that their expectations for students differed from expectations held by other staff and that they were "confused," "frustrated" and uncertain regarding Friendly House objectives for students. This uncertainty and confusion did not emerge when discussing the After School program, but instead surfaced when staff discussed the Summer School program offered at Friendly House. Finally, lacking what these staff described as "adequate structure," they perceived that pedagogy was adversely effected and that teaching and learning were being de-emphasized during the run of the Summer School program offered at Friendly House.

Question 2. To what extent is curriculum and instruction related to students' present and future lives? Explain.

The relationship between Friendly House curriculum and instruction and

students' present and future lives was occasionally uncertain for students. This finding was most pronounced when students discussed the relationship(s) between their feeder schools and Friendly House's After School program. In this instance, students explained that the Friendly House and feeder school relationship was built entirely on the completion of homework assignments. Students also explained that Friendly House staff: (a) could not identify feeder school teachers by name; (b) did not teach using methods introduced in the students' feeder schools; and © did not carry the same textbooks, workbooks and class materials as students' feeder schools.

Friendly house staff confirmed that resources including textbooks, workbooks and class materials duplicating those found in the students' feeder schools were largely unavailable during the After School and Summer School programs. Additionally, staff confirmed that assignments unrelated to feeder school assignments were given to students enrolled in the After School program when these students came unprepared and without homework activities. Finally, staff members interviewed indicated that they worked to draw supportive relationships between students' learning at Friendly House and students' current and future experiences and lives. This assertion was occasionally not corroborated by students who generally could not recall discussing their future aspirations (outside of schooling) in class during both the After School and Summer School programs at Friendly House. Students could recall discussions related to their past and present lives and discussions related to their communities and completing high school. But none of these students could identify having their particular career interests included in curriculum and supported by instructional methods used by Friendly House

staff.

Finally, students also did not cite the relationship between the Summer School program at their feeder schools except to say that they felt they retained more of their previous learning, and that students felt at an "advantage," more confident, and better prepared to begin instruction in the fall in their feeder schools than their peers who also were not enrolled in the Summer School program at Friendly House.

Question 3. What is your philosophy for working with students?

Practitioners' beliefs describes Friendly House instructors, tutors and administrators expressing commitment and extending their roles to work with students, focusing on students' strengths rather than weaknesses while demonstrating high tolerance for the attitudes and behaviors of students who may be resistant to teaching, learning, change and involvement in instruction and activities at Friendly House.

Analyses of the data collected through interviews with students and staff, when combined with observations and analyses of student work indicate that students believe that Friendly House instructors, tutors and administrators "care," are committed and are very supportive. These findings emerged when studying students' discussions of their interactions with their peers, and while analyzing students' descriptions of Friendly House staff. Students labeled peer relations as "very good," "good" and comfortable indicating that differences did not limit their interactions and preclude their acceptance at Friendly House. Additionally, students described staff as determined, supportive and dependable. These descriptions of staff surfaced as students recalled instructors, tutors and administrators working to account for and recognize student backgrounds and

language preferences while teaching. These conclusions reached by students were also corroborated by staff who confirmed that they (a) attempted to involve all students in teaching and learning; (b) used knowledge of students' backgrounds; and © that they used English and Spanish during After School and Summer School instruction.

In contrast to these earlier "positive" findings describing students' perceptions of staff and staff members' philosophies for working with Friendly House students, further analysis of the data gathered through interviews with students and staff, when combined with observations and analyses of student work indicate that instructors, tutors and administrators may generally have depressed expectations for the educational attainment and futures of Friendly House students. This conclusion emerged when analyzing staff members' perceptions of students' home environments, their cultural and language attributes, and students' maturation and career aspirations. Friendly House staff often described students' homes and neighborhoods as depressed and dangerous using terms and expressions like "broken" and "unsafe." In addition, while instructors, tutors and administrators valued students' cultural heritage and foreign language skills, staff nonetheless represented these characteristics as disadvantageous to students' future educational attainment. Finally, the absence of student participation in planning and the lack of formal support given to students' career aspirations in curriculum development and instruction may indicate that Friendly House staff attach a secondary level of importance to these student characteristics. Further, these omissions may indicate that instructors, tutors and administrators operating the After School and Summer School programs at Friendly House frame the students' aspirations

as unrealistic and their levels of maturation as low.

Question 4. What can you say about the support your given?

Institutional Support

Institutional support describes members providing adequate resources and aid to insure that 1) Friendly House staff have autonomy in decisions affecting the program(s); 2) sufficiency of time is allocated to work with students and other Friendly House instructors, tutors and administrators; 3) curriculum content and instructional practices reflect Friendly House goals and objectives; 4) efforts of members are efficient and resist duplication; and 5) extensive development ačtivities are available to instructors, tutors and administrators to insure that the needs of students and the partnership are being met.

Analyses of the data collected during this portion of the evaluation indicate that Friendly House instructors, tutors and administrators exercise different levels of autonomy during both the After School and Summer School programs. These levels of autonomy relate to program objectives and staff members' preferred instructional practices. For instance, analyses indicate that staff members' autonomy during the After School program is limited by the function of this program, and by the nature of the assignments given to students at their feeder schools. To a lesser degree, After School staff members' autonomy is limited by the required application of specific problem solving strategies as determined by feeder school practitioners that instructors, tutors and administrators may largely be unaware of. Also staff members' total reliance on students to bring homework to the Friendly House facility acts as a limitation on their

autonomy to plan and prepare for students.

Staff members autonomy during the Summer School program in contrast, is greatly increased and related to heightened staff morale. Evidence of this increased autonomy and improved Friendly House climate emerged and was confirmed while analyzing students' and staff members' responses and behaviors. Students described Friendly House Summer School staff as "more prepared," "smarter," more "enthusiastic" and "more excited about teaching" for example, when comparing to the After School program and its activities. Friendly House staff agreed, also indicating that greater opportunities to "plan," "cooperate" and "gather materials" for instruction occurred during the Summer School program. A limitation on the Summer School program that was described earlier relates to staff members' uncertainty regarding program objectives for students.

As discussed previously in this report, some staff revealed a desire for additional structure during the Summer School program. These staff members indicated that heightened structure was especially important during the summer months when students might be distracted and less disposed to working and learning at Friendly House.

Finally, students and all Friendly House staff members included in this evaluation pointed to severe resource limitations that adversely effected the quality of instruction offered during the After School and Summer School programs at Friendly House. These resource limitations included shortages in pencils, paper and copy machine options. Some Friendly House staff also described disparities in the availability and use

of copy machines, and high staff member turnover rates as limitations.

Time

During interviews and observations of students and staff, time was reported as a variable effecting the quality of services delivered during the After School program, but less a factor during the Summer School program at Friendly House. Friendly House students explained that they were too tired to work after school and staff confirmed this and reported that students were fatigued and occasionally less motivated during the After School program. Friendly House staff also indicated that they were rushed to transport and to help students with homework during the After School program so that the breadth and coverage of materials was also severely constrained. In contrast, when describing the Summer School program, students and staff explained that time was sufficient for working with students and other Friendly House instructors, tutors and administrators.

Curriculum Content and Instructional Practices

Analyses of interviews, observations and Friendly House documentation did not reveal formal planning efforts by staff to ensure that curriculum content and instructional practices reflected Friendly House goals and objectives. Nonetheless, analyses also indicated that "academic support," "social development" and "cultural awareness" were promoted and highly valued by these staff.

Efforts of Friendly House Members are Efficient and Resist Duplication

Aware of the severe limitations on staff and material resources, analyses indicate that little waste and unnecessary duplication exists at Friendly House.

Staff Development

Analyses of the data gathered for this evaluation did not yield findings on staff development and training activities. Interviews with staff indicated that monetary constraints also limited opportunities for the extensive development of activities and for instructors, tutors and administrators to receive training and to insure that the needs of students, staff and the Friendly House facility are being met.

Question 5. What is the purpose of the collaboration? Explain.

Analyses of the data collected indicate that the purpose of Friendly House was variously related by students and staff members to "academic support," "social development" and "cultural awareness." All students and staff members agreed that the After School and Summer School programs available at Friendly House functioned to further the academic performance of students. Different numbers of students and staff also concluded that social development and the promotion of cultural awareness were objectives for students. Some students also identified "safety" and "crime prevention" as functions of Friendly House.

Question 6. How well does the collaboration meet that purpose? Explain.

Students, instructors, tutors and administrators reported that Friendly House satisfied its purposes "very well" and "well." Analyses of social interactions and the climate of Friendly House also indicated and confirmed that respondents shared a high level of satisfaction with their performance and efforts and with the students' capacity to meet the outcomes and purposes highlighted earlier and contained in this evaluation report. In addition, cognizant of those institutional limitations related to material

resources, time, money and opportunities for staff development for example, it seems that Friendly House students, instructors, tutors and administrators are operating at near peak efficiency, and that Friendly House is a valuable asset to participating individuals and to members of the surrounding community.

Summary and Recommendations

Student Membership

Recommendations for enhancing student membership in school and in the After School and Summer School programs are related to increasing the relevance of program activities and to increasing levels of public school and interagency involvement and support. These recommendations are listed below and include:

- **establishing a formal articulation agreement with particular elementary schools, school districts and boards of education**

Analyses of the data collected indicate that Friendly House thrives largely by word of mouth. To improve curricular coordination between Friendly House's After School and Summer School programs and instructional programs offered in the local public feeder schools, it may be necessary for Friendly House supporters to meet with additional public school officials to help them to understand that Friendly House represents both a school and community asset. These supporters also must secure and/or borrow school textbooks, workbooks and resources that reflect current grade level programs of instruction. Makers of formal articulation agreements may choose to focus on small numbers of students at first to deliver relevant instructional support services and to assess Friendly House's capacity to assist these students in completing their schoolwork and schooling. Later, services delivered by Friendly House staff might be expanded to include additional opportunities for academic and student support.

Two fundamental questions must be addressed for Friendly House to establish a formal long-term articulation agreement with public schools. First, Friendly House

supporters must answer: What does Friendly House have to give specific public schools that these schools value and require? Second, "What is it that Friendly House can deliver to specific public schools that they need and that holds a value that exceeds the effort(s) and resources necessary in forming a formal long-term articulation agreement? Answering these questions may be difficult given broadly dispersed resource constraints and in light of the historic and sketchy relationship between public schools and public and private agencies. Nonetheless, to increase the membership and progress for students in public schools the relevance of After School and Summer School programs delivered at Friendly House must also be strengthened. Lacking this, the relevance, influence and utility of the After School and Summer School programs delivered at Friendly House will continue to be hampered and misunderstood by practitioners in the public school districts.

Student Engagement

Recommendations for enhancing student engagement in school and both the After School and Summer School programs are related to increasing knowledge of the backgrounds of students. These recommendations include:

- **creating an management information system (MIS) for gathering information about students' knowledge, interests, prior learning and prior experience in public schools regarding their strengths, weaknesses, grade point averages and Special Education classification(s)**

Analyses of the data collected indicate that Friendly House does not formally

solicit students for information on their prior knowledge and for descriptions of their experience(s) in their local feeder schools. Friendly House staff indicate that information about students' Special Education classification for example, is not gathered because of beliefs that this information may be inaccurate and lead to students being "stigmatized," poorly understood and inappropriately labeled at Friendly House. Analyses of the organization, content and preparation of personnel, and staff in the After School and Summer School programs similarly reveal that these programs may be inadequately funded and developed to serve students with Special Education related needs.

Research indicates that minority students, students at risk of dropping out and students that engage in crime in the future are also over represented in Special Education classes. Lacking knowledge of students' backgrounds in this case limits the potential for Friendly House staff to aid these students by developing a relevant individualized program of instruction (IEP). An accurate IEP might be useful for example for designing instructional programs that closely resemble regular education initiatives and that also meet students' needs and styles of learning. Additionally, accounting for students' styles of learning by attending to their prior knowledge, learning and IEPs may also help in developing and redesigning students IEPs and in solidifying services delivered to students and local public feeder schools.

and/or borrow school textbooks, workbooks and resources that reflect current grade level programs of instruction. Makers of formal articulation agreements may choose to focus on small numbers of at-risk students at first to deliver relevant instructional

support services and to assess Friendly House's capacity to assist these students in completing their schooling. Later, services delivered by Friendly House staff might be expanded to include additional opportunities for academic and student support.

Staff Expectations

Analyses of data collected through interviews, observations and research notes indicate that staff "care" and are "committed to serving students" and meeting Friendly House objectives. These analyses also reveal that Friendly House staff may hold depressed expectations for students' academic performance and futures. Analyses of data pertinent to instruction and staff members' philosophies for teaching students indicate for example that students' knowledge, maturation and prior experiences are compared with the knowledge, maturation levels and prior experiences of some instructors, tutors and administrators. This comparison may naturally lead to unflattering representations of the knowledge, maturation and prior experiences acquired by students, and may further influence staff to hold leveled expectations for the future academic and career success of students. Recommendations for enhancing staff expectations and the quality of instruction received during the After School and Summer School programs include:

- **providing staff development and training on multi cultural and multiethnic perspectives and experiences; this training must deliver instructional techniques for including student characteristics and learning styles in curriculum design and implementation, and must provide strategies for alternative instructional methodologies**

including team-teaching, format learning and valued centered leadership

Staff Turnover

Regulating staff turnover in the After School and Summer School programs at Friendly House coexists with limited financial resources as one of the greatest challenges faced by supporters of this community based organization. On going turnover requires additional staff training thus limiting the Friendly House budget, continuity, and the quality of programs delivered to Friendly House students. Recommendations for decreasing staff turnover in both the After School and Summer School programs are related to broadening public knowledge of the importance and activities provided, and to increasing the base of financial support available to Friendly House. These recommendations are listed below and include:

- **developing an interagency network of opportunities that can provide resources for learning and instruction that reflect the goals and objectives of the After School and Summer School programs provided at Friendly House. These resources may be related but are not limited to sharing staff, space, marketing technology, advanced computer technology and individual training. In addition, these resources and opportunities may be useful for addressing needs in the surrounding community, for satisfying the needs of particular institutions, and for helping Friendly House staff further minimize costs associated with duplication and the delivery of services.**

Collaboration, Friendly House Resources and Support

Like other community based organizations, Friendly House finds itself trapped in dependance and the search for different sources of funding. This search frequently involves competition with other community based organizations for monies, thus placing grantees in the position of having to choose between one agency and the next. More importantly, the array of services delivered to needy youth and families is severely curtailed as limited amounts of dollars are distributed and dispersed to a growing number of worthwhile community service providers. Friendly House staff do well to survive in light of these rigorous challenges and severe financial limitations. Nonetheless, analyses of that data lead to the following recommendation(s):

- **the broadening and diversification of financial sources and the budget at Friendly House may be consonant with acquiring increased support. In addition to the recommendations given earlier, this support may take the form(s) of research and foundation outlays. This recommendation requires that additional aid be given for uncovering information on these outlays and for completing competitive grant applications. Additionally, this recommendation suggests that Friendly House staff broaden their mission and redefine activities so that they might become useful for future inquiry, and so that Friendly House might be seen as a desirable and leading community based research laboratory.**

Friendly House Mission

Recommendations related to the Friendly House mission are also associated with enhancing clarity about the function(s) of this community based organization and both the After School and Summer School programs in particular. These recommendations are listed below and include:

- **posting a current and up to date mission statement that identifies the philosophy and functions of the collaboration and Friendly House**

Analyses of the data collected indicate that collaboration and Friendly House participants have some mixed understandings regarding the purposes of the collaboration and Friendly House After School and Summer School programs. These analyses also indicate that personnel and Friendly House staff have mixed beliefs about daily operations and the educational and future chances of students. Crafting and posting a mission statement may be useful for adding focus to the collaboration and existing After School and Summer School programs. Developing a mission statement may also be useful for increasing public school, interagency, public and private, and national support for the delivery of services to Friendly House students, staff and community members.

Conclusion

Friendly House Inc. provides important and needed services to students, youth, families and members in the community. This evaluation report indicates that Friendly House and its staff members are operating efficiently and effectively, and that they are providing an optimal level of individual and community support. Also included in this report are findings related to the quality of services delivered in the After School and

Summer School programs from 1995 to 1996. This assessment and evaluation of program quality led to recommendations related to increasing membership and engagement, and to recommendations for enhancing staff beliefs and organizational support.

Recommendations for curriculum development, pedagogy, staff training, daily operations, building an advocacy and budgeting were also provided. Finally, these recommendations were given to insure continued optimal performance, and to aid instructors, tutors, administrators and other staff in diversifying and broadening the array of services delivered to current and future students enrolled in the After School and Summer School programs at Friendly House.

Appendix A.

Question 1. How would you describe your relationship with school personnel and administrators instructors, tutors, students?

Table 2. CBO Responses to Question 1.

Respondent and Numbers of Responses	Relationship with:	Question 1. How would you describe your relationship with school personnel and administrators, instructors, tutors, and students ?				
		Very Good	Good	Average	Not Good	Very Bad
Students (12)	Students	10	2	0	0	0
	Instructors	8	4	0	0	0
	Tutors	8	4	0	0	0
	Administra.	10	2	0	0	0
	Personnel	1	2	8	1	0
Instructors (4)	Students	1	2	1	0	0
	Instructors	4	0	0	0	0
	Tutors	4	0	0	0	0
	Administra.	0	4	0	0	0
	Personnel	0	0	4	0	0
Tutors (8)	Students	3	4	1	0	0
	Instructors	7	1	0	0	0
	Tutors	7	1	0	0	0
	Administra.	7	1	0	0	0
	Personnel	0	0	5	3	0
Administra. (2)	Students	0	2	0	0	0
	Instructors	0	2	0	0	0
	Tutors	0	2	0	0	0
	Administra.	1	1	0	0	0
	Personnel	0	2	0	0	0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3. School Responses to Question 1.

Respondent and Numbers of Responses	Relationship with:	Question 1. How would you describe your relationship with school personnel and administrators, instructors, tutors, and students?				
		Very Good	Good	Average	Not Good	Very Bad
Teachers (16)	Students	11	5	0	0	0
	Instructors	2	7	7	0	0
	Tutors	2	7	7	0	0
	Administra.	2	7	7	0	0
	Personnel	14	2	0	0	0
Support Staff (8)	Students	1	6	1	0	0
	Instructors	1	5	2	0	0
	Tutors	1	2	5	0	0
	Administra.	0	6	2	0	0
	Personnel	2	6	0	0	0
Admini. (2)	Students	1	1	0	0	0
	Instructors	1	1	0	0	0
	Tutors	0	0	2	0	0
	Administra.	1	1	0	0	0
	Personnel	2	0	0	0	0

Appendix B

Question 2: To what extent is schooling and instruction related to students' present and future lives? Explain.

Table 4. Participant Responses to Question 2.

Respondent	Number of Responses	Question 2. To what extent is schooling and instruction related to students' present and future lives? Explain.				
		Very Strong Relationship	Strong Relationship	Average Relationship	Not Strong Relationship	Very Weak Relationship
Students	12	0	4	2	3	3
Instructors	4	1	1	2	0	0
Tutors	8	2	0	1	2	3
Administra.	2	0	0	2	0	0
Personnel	26	0	11	12	3	0

Appendix C

Question 3. What is your philosophy for working with partnership students?

Table 5. Participant Responses to Question 3.

Respondent	Number of Responses	Question 3. What is your philosophy for working with partnership students?			
		Academic Support	Social Development	Cultural Awareness	Other
Students	12	12	6	9	0
Instructors	4	4	4	4	0
Tutors	8	5	2	1	0
Administrators	2	2	2	2	0
Personnel	26	26	18	6	2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix D.

Question 4. What can you say about the support you are given to strengthen the collaboration? Explain.

Table 6. Participant Responses to Question 4.

Respondent	Number of Responses	Question 4. What can you say about the support you are given to strengthen the collaboration? Explain.				
		Very Strong	Strong	Average	Not Strong	Very Weak
Students	12	4	8	0	0	0
Instructors	4	2	1	1	0	0
Tutors	8.	2	4	2	0	0
Administra.	2	0	1	1	0	0
Personnel	26	2	6	16	2	0

Appendix E.

Question 5. What is the purpose of the collaboration? Explain.

Table 7. Participant Responses to Question 5.

Respondent	Number of Responses	Question 5. What is the purpose of the collaboration. Explain.			
		Academic Support	Social Development	Cultural Awareness	Other
Students	12	6	2	0	4
Instructors	4	4	2	2	0
Tutors	8	8	1	0	0
Administrators	2	2	2	1	1
Personnel	26	24	9	4	2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix F.

Question 6. How well does the collaboration meet that purpose? Explain.

Table 8. Participant Responses to Question 6.

Respondent	Number of Responses	Question 6. How well does the collaboration meet that purpose? Explain.				
		Very Well	Well	Average	Not Well	Poorly
Students	12	5	7	0	0	0
Instructors	4	1	3	0	0	0
Tutors	8	3	5	0	0	0
Administra.	2	1	1	0	0	0
Personnel	26	9	14	2	1	0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix G

Questionnaires

Friendly House Personnel

Question One:

Do you make the first move to create a positive respectful relationship with your students? How/what do you do?

Question Two:

To what extent do you relate school and work to your students' present and future lives? How/what do you do?

Probes:

_____*1. Do they buy into what you do?*
_____*2. Why/why not?*
_____*3. Does school hold any importance for them?*
_____*4. How is school important?*
_____*5. How is school important for their future lives?*
_____*6. Think about one of your successful students?*
_____*7. How was (s)he successful?*
_____*8. How did this make you feel?*

Question Three:

What is your philosophy for working with these students?

_____*9. Do you find it easy to work with him/her?*
_____*10. Why/why not?*
_____*11. How was (s)he easy?*
_____*12. Do you think this student's personnel characteristics make it easy to work with him/her?*
_____*13. What characteristics make it successful?*
_____*14. In a typical day, how much time do you spend working this student?*
_____*15. Do you function in different roles when working with this student?*
_____*16. Do you ever involve their parents in schooling?*
_____*17. How? Why/why not?*
_____*18. How do you explain the success of this student in your school?*
_____*19. What do you believe personnel in other schools should do to help minority students succeed?*
_____*20. Have you ever included their interests in schooling?*
_____*21. Do these students fit in well with others?*
_____*22. Have you ever modified your instructional and disciplinary practices when working with these students?*
_____*23. Why/why not? How?*
_____*24. Have you ever modified curriculum?*
_____*25. Why/why not? How?*
_____*26. Are students allowed to communicate using their native language?*
_____*27. What are you covering with your students now?*

Question Four:

What can you tell me about the school support your given to work with these students?

_____28. *To what extent are you given ample freedom to make decisions about how, what, and when you teach these students?*

_____29. *Do other school personnel support your decisions regarding these students?*

_____30. *Who decides how, what, and when you will teach these students?*

_____31. *Do staff participate in team-planning or team-teaching?*

_____32. *Do staff participate in decision making based upon on-going needs assessments?*

_____33. *How many students do you have?*

_____34. *How many of your students come from minority groups?*

_____35. *Do you have enough time to work effectively with these students?*

Appendix H
Questionnaires
Friendly House Students

Question One:
Does your teacher make the first move to create a positive respectful relationship with you? How/what does (s)he do?
Question Two:
To what extent does your teacher relate school and work to your present and future lives? How/what do you do?
Probes:

_____1. *Do you buy into what they do?*
_____2. *Why/why not?*
_____3. *Does school hold any importance for you?*
_____4. *How is school important?*
_____5. *How is school important for your future life?*
_____6. *Think about one of your favorite teachers?*
_____7. *Why was (s)he your favorite?*
_____8. *How did (s)he make you feel?*

Question Three:
How does your teacher like working with you and other students?

_____9. *Is it easy to work with him/her?*
_____10. *Why/why not?*
_____11. *How was (s)he easy?*
_____12. *Do you think his/her personnel characteristics make it easy to work with him/her?*
_____13. *What characteristics make it easy?*
_____14. *In a typical day, how much time do you spend working your teacher one to one?*
_____15. *Do you trust your teacher? Why/why not?*
_____16. *Does (s)he ever involve your parents in schooling?*
_____17. *How? Why/why not?*
_____18. *How do you explain your success in school?*
_____19. *What do you believe teachers in other schools should do to help students succeed?*
_____20. *Have your interests ever been included in schooling?*
_____21. *Do you have many friends in your school?*
_____22. *Has your teacher ever changed his/her teaching and disciplinary practices when working with you or other students?*
_____23. *Why/why not? How?*
_____24. *Have they ever modified curriculum?*
_____25. *Why/why not? How?*
_____26. *Are you allowed to communicate using your native language?*
_____27. *What are your teachers covering with you now?*

Question Four:

What can you tell me about the school support your teachers are given to work with you and other students?

_____28. *Are they given ample freedom to make decisions about how, what, and when they teach you?*

_____29. *Do other teachers support them?*

_____30. *Who decides how, what, and when they will teach you?*

_____31. *Do your teachers participate in team-planning or team-teaching?*

_____32. *Do your teachers participate in decision making based upon on-going needs assessments?*

_____33. *How many students are in your class(es)?*

_____34. *How many of students come from minority groups?*

_____35. *Do your teachers have enough time to work effectively with you and other students?*

Appendix I

Questionnaire:

Observation and Document Analyses Protocol

I. School Membership.

_____*1. Teacher initiates efforts to create positive respectful relations with students.*

II. Educational Engagement.

_____*2. Teacher relates school to students' present and future.*

_____*3. Teacher expresses care and concern for students.*

III. Teacher Beliefs.

_____*4. Teacher expresses personal commitment to working with students.*

_____*5. Teacher extends role to help students with personal problems.*

_____*6. Teacher believes students can succeed if focus on strengths rather than weaknesses.*

_____*7. Teacher does not give up easily when student do not understand, respond, or resist efforts.*

_____*8. Teacher identifies interests of students.*

_____*9. Teacher designs learning strategies to increase student involvement.*

_____*10. Teacher creates structure for learning success.*

IV. School Support.

_____*11. Teacher understands role in decisions affecting the program.*

_____*12. Teacher reports autonomy to establish curriculum content, context, and credit.*

_____*13. Teacher maximizes student teacher ratio for the class.*

_____*14. Teacher demonstrates sufficiency of time to work with students, parents, and colleagues.*

References

Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory. Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago: Aldine.

Heath, S.B., & McLaughlin, M.W. (1994). "The best of both worlds: Connecting schools and community youth organizations for all-day, all-year learning," Educational Administration Quarterly, 30, 3: 278-300.

Ogbu, J. (1989). "Variablity in minority school performance: A problem in search of an explanation," Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 18: 312-334.

Peña, R. (1995). "Teacher expectations and students with challenging behaviors," Current Issues in Middle Level Education, 4: 67-78.

Wehlage, G.G., Rutter, R.A., Smith, G.A., Lesko, N., & Fernandez, R.R. (1989). Reducing the risk: Schools as communities of support. Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.

Wehlage, G.G. & Rutter, R.A. (1986). "Dropping out: How do schools contribute to the problem?" Teachers College Record, 87, 374-392.